



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/944,157	09/04/2001	Stefan Reh	076326-0194	9080

22428 7590 03/11/2003

FOLEY AND LARDNER
SUITE 500
3000 K STREET NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20007

EXAMINER

FLORES SANCHEZ, OMAR

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3724

DATE MAILED: 03/11/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/944,157

Applicant(s)

REH ET AL.

Examiner

Omar Flores-Sánchez

Art Unit

3724

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 December 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 10-14 and 17-22 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7-9, 15 and 16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Claims 10-14, 17-21 and 22 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention and nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in Paper No. 8.
2. Applicant's election with traverse of Group I and Species I in Paper No. 8 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the method step of claim 1 could not be practiced by hand. This is not found persuasive because the method of forming a weakening area in airbag cover could be practiced by hand.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-3, 7-9 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bauer.

Bauer discloses a method of forming a weakening area in airbag cover comprising the set of: providing a cutting support; providing a cutter having a blade Fig. 7; placing the airbag with

the decorative facing down on the support; and cutting a tear line of a predetermined pattern Fig.8.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bauer in view of Towler et al. (foreign patent no. 2, 205, 284).

Bauer discloses the method of forming a weakening area in airbag cover substantially as claimed except for applying a predetermined force to the area of the cover and maintaining the cover against the support with a vacuum. However, Towler teaches the step of applying a predetermined force to the area of the cover and maintaining the cover against the support with a vacuum for the purpose of precisely positioning and supporting the workpiece. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Bauer's cutting support by providing the vacuum as taught by Towler in order to obtain a precisely position and support for the cover.

7. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bauer.

Bauer discloses the method of forming a weakening area in airbag cover substantially as claimed except for an oscillating cutter. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify Bauer by providing an oscillating cutter, since applicant has not disclosed that the oscillating cutter solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with oscillating cutter.

8. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bauer in view of foreign patent no. DE 4424686 A1.

Towler discloses the method of forming a weakening area in airbag cover substantially as claimed except for an end having a semicircular shape. However, foreign patent '686 teaches the use of an end having a semicircular shape 18, 20 for the purpose of preventing the tearing action which occurs along the breaking line from being extended beyond the end of the breaking line. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Towler's device by providing the end having a semicircular shape as taught by foreign patent '686 in order to prevent the tearing action which occurs along the breaking line from being extended beyond the end of the breaking line.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 3724


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Omar Flores-Sánchez whose telephone number is 703-308-0167. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Allan Shoap can be reached on 703-308-1082. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9302 for regular communications and 703-872-9302 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1148.

ofs
March 7, 2003


KENNETH E. PETERSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER